

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 25, and 27 are amended by the present amendment. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,619,343 to Amemiya; Claims 11-14 and 25-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,349,419 to Taguchi et al. (hereinafter "Taguchi") in view of Amemiya; and Claims 5-10 and 19-24 are allowed.

Applicants and Applicants' representatives thank Examiners Grant and Carter for the courtesy of the interview conducted on February 10, 2005. During the interview, differences between the inventions of the rejected independent claims and the applied references were discussed. Further, claim amendments to clarify the claimed features were also discussed. The present response sets forth the discussed claim amendments and the following remarks set forth the discussed differences.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Amemiya, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Though amended independent Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17 are different in scope and/or statutory category, each of those claims recite a compressing unit/means that switches between compressing only a portion of scanning lines of each of obverse and reverse image data, respectively, until all of the scanning lines of the obverse and reverse image data are compressed. Claims 2, 4, 16, and 18 depend from Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17, respectively.

Applicants' Figures 9 and 10 illustrate a non-limiting example of the above-noted feature. As shown, the first through fourth scanning lines of the observe image data are compressed; and then the first through fourth scanning lines of the reverse image data are compressed. Thereafter, the fifth through eighth scanning lines of the obverse image data are compressed; and then the fifth through eighth scanning lines of the reverse image data are compressed. Thus, the compressor 902 switches between compressing only a portion of the scanning lines of each of the obverse and reverse image data, respectively, until all of the scanning lines (e.g., the first through eighth scanning lines of the observe and reverse image data) are compressed.

The outstanding Office Action cites the encoder 9 of Amemiya's Figure 1 as teaching the compressing units/means of Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17. However, Amemiya discloses that all of the image data of one side of a document is compressed by the encoder 9; and then all of the image data of the other side of the document is compressed by the encoder 9.¹ Thus, the encoder 9 of Amemiya does not teach the above-noted feature of Claims 1, 3, 15, and 17.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-4 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Amemiya be withdrawn.

Addressing now the rejection of Claims 11-14 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Amemiya, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Though amended independent Claims 11, 13, 25, and 27 are different in scope and/or statutory category, each of those claims recites an appending unit/means which appends identifying information to image data, the identifying information identifying whether the image data corresponds to an obverse surface or a reverse surface of a document. Each of those claims also recites that the image data with the appended identifying information is

¹ Amemiya, column 5, lines 22-52.

transmitted via a communication line. Claims 12, 14, 26, and 28 depend from Claims 11, 13, 25, and 27, respectively.

Figure 14a illustrates a non-limiting example of the above-noted feature. The obverse image data controller 203a and the reverse image data controller 203b add identifying data to the obverse image data and the reverse image data, respectively, before outputting the same to a bus 220.²

The outstanding Office Action cites Taguchi at column 7, lines 60 to column 8, line 19 as teaching the appending of identifying information. However, the cited portion of Taguchi merely discloses that a recording material, itself, is marked to identify the recorded image as a front side recording having a mirror perspective. A reading unit operator may later identify the front side recordings and select special processing to correct for their mirror perspectives.³ Thus, Taguchi's identifying information is not appended to the read image data; and is not transmitted over a communication line, as claimed. Amemiya does not cure this deficiency of Taguchi.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 11-14 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Taguchi in view of Amemiya be withdrawn.

² For the written description, see specification at page 49, lines 9-18.

³ Taguchi, column 7, line 36 to column 8, line 19.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

GJM/SS/STD/kke/rac
I:\ATTY\STD\20's\202321US\202321US.AM1.120304(2).DOC